

RESPONSE

These arguments and remarks are responsive to the first Office Action on the merits in this matter, mailed January 31, 2006. In view of the arguments and remarks made herein, the applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and further examination of this application.

In response to the various rejections set forth in the Official Action, the specific remarks are set forth below.

REMARKS

The examiner has raised the following issues:

1. **Rejection based on 35 U.S.C. §102(e)
as anticipated by Golding (U.S. Patent No. 6,745,507)**

The examiner has rejected claims 1-3, 6-9, and 11 as being anticipated by Golding (U.S. Patent No. 6,745,507). The applicant respectfully disagrees.

As set forth in MPEP § 2131, a claim is anticipated only if each and every element in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claim. The applicant again points out to the examiner that this is not the situation here.

Importantly, as just discussed, the cited reference does not teach every aspect of the invention, as set forth in newly amended claims 12 and claims dependent thereon, either explicitly or impliedly. Accordingly, continued rejection based on 35 U.S.C. §102(e) is not proper, and thus it is respectfully requested that this basis of rejection be withdrawn.

2. **Rejection based on 35 USC § 103(a)
as being unpatentable (obvious) over Golding (U.S. Patent No. 6,745,507) in view of Thelen (U.S. Patent No. 5,709,045).**

The examiner has also rejected claims 4, 5, and 12-14 as being obvious over Golding (U.S. Patent No. 6,745,507) in view of Thelen (U.S. Patent No. 5,709,045).

To establish prima facie obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the

prior art. Importantly, the test is not whether the differences would have been obvious, but whether the claimed invention as a whole would have been obvious. See MPEP Section 2142. With respect to the claimed invention, as presented in amended claim 12, and claims dependent thereon, various features, including the use of electro-luminescent panels, are not taught or suggested by either the Golding '507 or the Thelen '045 references or the combination thereof.

Since cited the prior art references do not teach or suggest all of the claim limitations, as presented, it is respectfully submitted that a prima facie case of obviousness has not been made out by the examiner. Consequently, it is respectfully requested that this basis of rejection be withdrawn.

3. ANNOTATED MARKED-UP DRAWINGS
WITH ATTACHMENT REPLACEMENT SHEETS
AND FORMAL DRAWINGS

Proposed amendments to the drawings are provided to bring the drawing into conformance with the specification.

Formal drawings are provided assuming the proposed amendments are approved. Please advise if any questions remain after review.

SUMMARY

This amendment is in response to the Examiner's Office Action mailed January 19, 2006.

The substitute specification as requested is herein provided. It is believed that this application now complies with the requirements of 37 C.F.R. § 1.121.

This Amendment is being made in order to include specification changes to conform the specification with the disclosure of the proposed drawing amendments made to the drawings.

These changes are straightforward and self explanatory and have not been made for any reason related to patentability of the subject matter with respect to any prior art references.

It is respectfully submitted that in view of the amendments made herein, and the arguments made above, that the applicant's invention is not made obvious by the prior art of record, as the invention is now claimed. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of all objections based on 35 U.S.C. §102(e) and §103(a) is respectfully requested.

In the event any further issues remain after consideration of this response, the undersigned would welcome a phone call or e-mail in an attempt to resolve outstanding matters and bring the case into condition for allowance.

Favorable consideration of this application is therefore believed to be in order and such action is earnestly solicited.

AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION

MAILED JANUARY 31, 2006

Attorney Docket No. RG2-3138-U

Done at Kent, County of King, State of Washington, on this
31st day of July, 2006.

Respectfully submitted,

PHILIP PADILLA RUIZ
GLENN NOEL PADILLE RUIS

Phone: 253-859-9128
Fax: 253-859-8915
Customer No. 20793
e-mail: goodpatent@earthlink.net

BY: 
SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY

R. Reams Goodloe, Jr.
Reg. No. 32,466

24722-104th Avenue, S.E.
Suite 102
Kent, Washington
98030-5322